

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated September 30, 2009. In the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 25, and 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in light of various combinations of U.S. Patent No. 7,222,786 ("*Renz*"), U.S. Patent No. 6,112,502 ("*Frederick*"), and Official Notice. In response to the Office Action, Claims 1 and 4 have been amended, and Claim 27 has been canceled. Thus, as a result of this Amendment, Claims 1-5, 25, and 28 are pending in the application.

#### **A. Rejection of Independent Claim 1**

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the scope of the claim based on the Examiner's comments. In particular, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite "in response to generating the restocking order, automatically generating a restocking package at the restocking storage location to fulfill the restocking order." Applicant submits that at least these features are not disclosed or suggested by *Renz* and *Frederick*.

In general, *Renz* discloses systems and methods for performing analysis of inventory data. In performing the analysis, *Renz* purports to determine when to "request a replenishment of the inventory from a warehouse or the production of goods by a manufacturer to replenish the inventory in a warehouse or at a store."

*Frederick* generally discloses a system for monitoring and dispensing medical items to patients. For example, a user may select a patient for whom specific medical items will be administered. In response to the selection of the patient and the specific medical items, the requested items are dispensed from dispensing devices. *Frederick* further discloses that the storage locations in the dispensing devices may be restocked.

In contrast to *Renz* and *Frederick*, the present application is directed to the (a) monitoring of supplies at decentralized storage locations and a restocking location and (b) ordering and replenishment of supplies at the decentralized storage locations and the restocking location. For example, independent Claim 1 recites (a) determining if a first quantity of an item stored at a decentralized storage location is below a first predetermined level and (b) automatically generating a restocking order to restock the item at the decentralized storage location in response to the first quantity of the item being below the first predetermined level. Independent Claim 1

also recites “in response to generating the restocking order, automatically generating a restocking package at the restocking storage location to fulfill the restocking order.” Thus, for instance, as an item (e.g., a medical supply or medication) is dispensed from a decentralized storage location, the inventory of the item at the decentralized storage location is electronically determined. If the inventory of the item falls below a first predetermined level, a restocking order to restock the decentralized storage location is automatically generated. Further, in response to generating the restocking order, a restocking package is automatically generated at the restocking storage location to fulfill the restocking order. The restocking package includes items stored at the decentralized storage location that are below predetermined thresholds.

Applicant submits that at least these concepts are not disclosed or suggested by *Renz* and *Frederick*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 as amended is not obvious in light of *Renz* and *Frederick* and therefore requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

#### **B. Rejection of Dependent Claims 3 and 25**

Dependent Claims 3 and 25 depend from independent Claim 1 and include all of the recitations thereof. Accordingly, for this reason and for the reasons stated above with respect to independent Claim 1, dependent Claims 3 and 25 are patentable over the references cited in the Office Action.

#### **C. Rejection of Dependent Claims 2, 4, and 28**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected dependent Claims 2, 4, and 28 as being obvious in light of *Renz*, *Frederick*, and Official Notice. However, the taking of Official Notice does not fulfill the above-discussed deficiencies of *Renz* and *Frederick*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 2, 4, and 28 are not obvious in light of any combination of the references cited in the Office Action and requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

#### **D. Conclusion**

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated

Appl. No.: 10/730,657  
Amdt. dated December 30, 2009  
Response to Office Action dated September 30, 2009

September 30, 2009. The foregoing amendments and remarks are believed to have placed the present application in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at (404) 881-4381 or e-mail at dane.baltich@alston.com to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dane A. Baltich/

Dane A. Baltich  
Registration No. 55,274

**Customer No. 00826**  
**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000  
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON December 30, 2009.